



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

tribute in connection with the Babylonian revolt, or in an actual transportation for participation in the revolt. The repentance, however, is the mere theory of the midrashist, who sought an explanation of the wicked king's long reign.

Many other sources were also available to the chronicler, and he has preserved valuable information regarding the families of the kings, their building operations and their border wars. Whenever the religious interest is not involved, a careful study of each incident may yield historical fact. The registers (chaps. 1-9), while derived from written sources, have been extraordinarily worked over. No historical reliance can be placed upon the tribal genealogies. The descent of the high-priests from Aaron and of the singers from Samuel are quite unhistorical. The geographical lists, however, probably contain much valuable information, but the text is in very bad condition.

The date of the compilation is probably about 300 B. C., but it has received many additions. As the Levitical families enlarged and their duties became more diverse, new genealogical lists were added. There was a constant tendency to add material from the earlier and more revered canonical books. The chronicler was a Levitical singer, and so dwelt much upon the sacred song, but there are indications of additions by one specially interested in the instruments of music and their proper use.

THEODORE G. SOARES.

OAK PARK, ILL.

EZEKIEL AND DANIEL. By CAMDEN M. COBERN. (= "Commentary on the Old Testament," edited by Wheedon, Vol. VIII.) New York: Eaton & Mains; Cincinnati: Jennings & Pye, 1901. Pp. 415. \$2.50.

THESE comments on Ezekiel and Daniel have been written under the pressure of pastoral duty in two of the largest and most important charges in American Methodism. Great debts have been raised, large plans of institutional church work projected, and many hundreds admitted to the church on confession of faith while this work was being carried forward. . . . No one can be more sensible than the writer of the difficulty, if not the impossibility, of doing one's best critical work under the circumstances.

Thus we read as we open the book at the preface. The statement does not sound encouraging, except to those concerned with American Methodism. For those who are seeking light on Ezekiel and Daniel the apology destroys expectation. It is a matter of concern to every

Christian, to whatever denomination he may belong, that great debts have been paid, great plans projected, and great masses brought into the church; but such things do not help the student of these obscure and difficult books of the Bible. Such an excuse is valid for delay, but if an author finds it impossible to put his best work on a book, why write at all? The best in Ezekiel and Daniel is poor enough; what we are to look for in confessedly second-best work is easily imagined. There are many brief excerpts from scholars who have written about Ezekiel and Daniel, but this work cannot be classed as a scholarly production. We do not find in it much fresh light on these puzzling books, nor does it sufficiently acquaint us with the best work done by others. The author assumes an extreme conservative position in regard to Ezekiel, and builds upon it without scruple. For example, he sets against the harsh things which have been said about Ezekiel this statement:

In St. John's highest hour of rapture he saw the vision which Ezekiel had seen six centuries before. Surely St. John and the Teacher of Nazareth were as good judges of Hebrew style and spiritual visions as any modern professor, and this judgment is not so severe.

This assertion assumes that John wrote the Apocalypse; but that conclusion is scarcely tenable as an assumption. The apostle may have been a better judge of "spiritual vision" than any modern professor, for aught we know, but we think he was not likely to be as good a judge of "Hebrew style." Dr. Cobern alleges that our Lord adopted Ezekiel's method of teaching, and used his writings more than those of any other prophet (p. 19). Surely there is no good warrant for such a statement. Moreover, Ezekiel needs no such bolstering. The notes on the text show that the author has spiritual insight and power. While they contribute little to a knowledge of Ezekiel, they are doubtless good for edification.

When we turn to the treatment of Daniel, we are surprised to note that the introduction covers almost exactly the same space as the commentary. There is a good deal of this disproportionately long introduction that is not important in a popular book. On the whole, however, the work is here better done than in the treatment of Ezekiel. There are many signs of a deep interest, if not in Daniel, at all events in the times to which the history is supposed to belong. Dr. Cobern rejects both the extreme views, on the one side, that Daniel is authentic history and prophecy, and, on the other, that it is pure fiction. He holds that it is "an apocalypse, a vision in which the

past is opened and made to live again, in which the ancient prophet speaks as if still alive" (p. 263).

The author makes unquestioned use of Ezekiel's allusion to Daniel (p. 298). In the note on Ezek. 14:14 he dismisses forthwith the proposed emendation of "Enoch" for "Daniel," a correction which Cheyne pronounces to be certainly necessary, and which has so much in its favor that the building on Ezekiel's mention of Daniel is surely precarious.

L. W. BATTEN.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

ZUR GENESIS DER AGADA. Beitrag zur Entstehungs- und Entwicklungsgeschichte des talmudischen Schriftthums. Von N. I. WEINSTEIN. II. Theil: *Die alexandrinische Agada*.¹ Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1901. Pp. 275. M. 7.

THE identity of the talmudic *minim* has exercised the ingenuity of scholars since the time of Elias Levita. In the face of a categorical declaration of the Palestinian Talmud that **לֹא גִלּוּ יִשְׂרָאֵל עַד שֶׁנִּנְעֲשֶׂר** **כִּדְ כְּחוֹת שֶׁל מִיִּנִים** (*Sanhedr.*, X, 5), pains have been taken to recognize in them exclusively now one, now another heresy. They were thus identified in turn with the Manichæans, Zarathustrians, Jewish Christians, Hellenists, etc. In 1898 Friedländer entered the lists of this somewhat futile tournament with a book entitled *Der vorchristliche jüdische Gnosticismus*,² in which he maintained with considerable sagacity and spirit that the *Mínim* are no other than Antinomian Jewish Gnostics, who formed the radical wing of Hellenistic Judaism. This was an amplification and defense of a former essay of his in which the importance of those Jews for the universalizing of Judaism was defended sympathetically and ably, though perhaps not in a way to carry conviction.³ Our author enters upon Friedländer's work with the easy conscience of an ancient Israelite spoiling an Egyptian, not, however, before mutilating the original idea almost beyond recognition. For while Friedländer draws an important distinction between the conservative majority and the radical minority, Dr. Weinstein speaks unqualifiedly of Alexandrian Judaism, and in this way what was at least plausible becomes now preposterous.

¹ Part I will appear in 1902.

² See CLEMEN'S review in this JOURNAL, Vol. IV (1900), pp. 164, 165.

³ *Das Judenthum in der vorchristlichen jüdischen Welt*. See this JOURNAL, Vol. II (1898), pp. 213, 214.